

## II Posner's Dependability and That of His Sources.

As this chapter begins it may appear to be perhaps trivial, perhaps petty, but in at least three areas ~~as it develops~~ it is neither trivial nor petty. Besides, who at 80 and engaged upon what he regards as serious work can think of wasting time on ~~the~~ trivialities or on pettiness?

One purpose is to tell more of the story of the JFK assassination and its investigations, to tell readers what they cannot or do not know about both. ~~That is significant.~~ <sup>see still again that</sup>

Another is to let the reader ~~decide whether~~ Posner's pretense that he has closed the case has <sup>no</sup> validity and indeed, <sup>that</sup> ~~whether~~ <sup>not</sup> he could have, even in his own mind, any <sup>to believe</sup> legitimate reason <sup>that</sup> he had or had even tried to do that.

As always, there is also <sup>his</sup> persistent digs ~~and~~ at and cuts of others, his possible reasons for them and what they reflect of him as a person and of his writing and its dependability. His book was launched with virtually unprecedented attention before a massive audience of Americans and others, with the assurance that it asked and This is not done with bars and arrows. That the sheets both throughout raises questions, answered all questions with dependability and finality. <sup>literary and personal!</sup>

With regard to that remarkable launching that did reach ~~so~~ many Americans and whether it and/or the book itself persuaded people that it was the definitive book, it seems conspicuous in its unusualness that in the two weeks after its debut so impressive in the number of people <sup>Reached to be</sup> ~~reached~~ and influenced I got not a single telephone call asking me anything at all about it or a single letter <sup>with</sup> ~~simt~~ that purpose. <sup>Not even from "critics."</sup>

At the same time, ~~of~~ all the newspaper, radio and TV accounts ~~written~~, not a single reporter asked my opinion of <sup>the</sup> ~~either~~ book or its advertising and promotion.

~~One Washington TV station was going to interview me - its reporter did not speak to me or ~~ask~~ have others ask it of me - that was abandoned for a reason that says much about what ~~the~~ news has become <sup>and how that can be exploited by publishers,</sup>~~

~~It was about lunchtime when I was phoned, to be aired on the evening news that is broadcast six hours later. The station was going to send a microwave truck so the telecast could be live. Just as the crew was preparing to leave, when a new member joined it, he, knowing this area at the bottom of the first range of the Appalachians~~

2x4/5

going west, expressed the belief that because of the hills and the trees a microwave signal would not reach Washington well if at all. Microwaves are line-of-sight and there would be barriers. I said I was willing to drive further up the mountain with the crew to where they could easily find a variety of attractive backgrounds <sup>also suggested</sup> and I suggested that it could be taped. There was plenty of time and with the editing tape makes possible, more information could be given to the people.

True? Horrors! With tape the station cannot proclaim it is live, that the station is on the spot at the moment of breaking news.

Which a microwave telecast would not have been <sup>in any event.</sup>

But it would give the appearance of being on the spot when news broke.

For decades TV news thrived without giving that appearance, as before that newsreels also did.

But microwave, at least in the collective mind at TV stations, is now a sine qua non—it simply <sup>used</sup> must be if only for appearances. The new need is for appearance, not <sup>substance or</sup> content. Microwave thus becomes a must.

What would not have been possible with microwave, something that had not been reported or even hinted at in another major attention-getting story, would have been informative. <sup>microwave</sup> Doing that <sup>many</sup> would have wasted too <sup>wasting</sup> much time for precious TV moments.

Coinciding with the <sup>government</sup> rushed <sup>d</sup> Random House release of Posner's book <sup>to coincide with</sup> was the disclosure of a vast volume of JFK assassination records that had been withheld improperly, in violation of the law. Estimates of their volume ranged from 80,000 <sup>500,000</sup> pages to over a million pages. That <sup>was</sup> as another government trick, a staged <sup>"we have nothing to hide" while hiding</sup> media event. What was lost in all the reporting is that disclosures of that <sup>magnitude</sup> nature by their <sup>magnitude alone</sup> nature defy any meaningful access. People cannot visualize that <sup>about \$300,000 in all,</sup> that quantity of paper, or its cost, or the cost and space of storing it, or the impossibility of searching it without the index that does not exist. So, I <sup>Q</sup> suggested that pictures of my archive, of only about a third of what was in such haste just dumped upon the unquestioning media, <sup>requires sixty file</sup> would illustrate the volume, <sup>How many Americans can invest this much money in buying</sup> the costs and the frustrating of any meaningful access. Have many people ever seen <sup>sixty</sup> those records? <sup>How many can find space for a hundred and fifty file</sup> How many can find space for <sup>cabincts?</sup> <sup>45 A file</sup> almost <sup>cabincts?</sup> <sup>45 A file</sup> almost

If some media components wanted to consider such an investment for a story or stories, would <sup>they</sup> ~~it~~ invest the enormous cost in time for reporters to work their way through that incredible volume of records? Could they think of completing that without spending many, many years on it, years for which ~~those reporters were paid?~~ <sup>would be paid for producing nothing?</sup> Obviously they would not.

Obviously, meaningful scholarship is impossible in so great a volume of information. This is probably one of the reasons it was all disclosed at one time, to prevent any meaningful access to the contents.

After almost three decades of suppression the media did not ask why, if all those records could then be released, they had not been released in stages over all those years.

Similarly, the almost simultaneous launching of the Posner book was met by no meaningful questions, and the media went along with the Random House staging that made it impossible for such questions to be asked, if the media had wanted to.

It did not want to and none were asked in the ~~wake~~ wake of that spectacular launching.

Although many in the media know of me and my work, I got not a single question by any reporter ~~asking~~ writing a story. If on the books release I had been asked any questions, I could not have read the book by the time ~~xxxx~~ any question would have been asked because it was not possible for me to have gotten and read the book by that time.

Random House, too, knew how to stage a major media event and it did, quite successfully.

46 jobs  
~~extra space~~  
 extra space



~~all~~ Americans just trying to find a place for that ocean of paper in which all the media was drowned immediately and for far into the future any meaningful scholarship necessarily would be? 464 here

Fortunately, our home has a full basement. The moving lens could give the people who saw the pictures, as could not have happened anywhere else in the country, a notion of the magnitude of the ~~problems~~ <sup>problems</sup> created all over again by the government in the wrongful withholding of ~~those papers~~ <sup>all records</sup> that could and should have been disclosed in stages years ago ~~in response to requests made under the law in its launching of this tidal-wave of paper~~ <sup>in which to drown all intending a scholar by search.</sup>

The technicians liked the idea. But it was not microwave, not instant when there was no need to be instant. So, it was not done.

Appearance, in the jocular ~~or~~ phrase of my youth, is everything in life. It is that again when I am 80, when it frustrates <sup>real</sup> reporting and <sup>government</sup> when media events are laughed, as with book ~~when they also are~~ <sup>it was a</sup> ~~launched.~~ <sup>book</sup>

As Posner's ~~was~~ <sup>of being</sup> launched. It was ~~given~~ <sup>what</sup> the appearance of being ~~what~~ it is not. ~~What it could not be.~~

~~What it was known it could not be.~~

When the Posners came to our home in February, 1992, they <sup>impression</sup> gave the ~~in appearance~~ of being what ~~they~~ <sup>and</sup> Gerald represented them to be, serious, impartial, energetic researchers engaged on a ~~new~~ project that was worthwhile to me. From their appearance <sup>and</sup> ~~from the appearance the intended project,~~ <sup>their representation of their</sup> we like them. While whether or not I liked them would have <sup>been of</sup> ~~been of~~ no consequence because as a matter of principle and policy I have always made all those records I obtained from all those lawsuits available to all writing in the field. This means, almost without exception, those with whom I do not agree, those I know will write what I do not agree with. So, that we liked the Posners was not a factor in my turning them loose, without supervision, without <sup>even</sup> ~~myself~~ checking the counter on our copying machine to learn how many copies Trisha made.

464 here

If Gerald had not deceived me about the book he was writing he would have had the same access, as all others have. It is <sup>it</sup> ~~not~~ pleasant when it occurs but one cannot

Freedom of Information

Those not familiar with the law and its purposes may consider my attitude strange. After all, I struggle against all that power for years in court, bear all the <sup>costs</sup> expenses, so why should I give it without any charge to others, especially to my competitors?

I regard the FOIA concept as the most American of concepts. It says that the people have the right to know what their government does. I believe that those of us who use FOIA become surrogates for the people. It is all the people who ~~are~~ have the entitlement. I therefore believe that the records I get are <sup>mine as</sup> not ~~my~~ personal property and that I have the obligation to let others see, use and copy them. It is that simple. To me, at least.

~~live~~ more than a third the age of the country without contact with the real world or without having been received.

I became aware of ~~the~~ <sup>Posner's</sup> deception in June, 1993, when I was sent a copy of the article from Publishers Weekly I quote in this book, knowing that ~~the~~ <sup>his</sup> book would not be what Gerald told me it would be did not disturb me enough to rush out and get the special edition of ~~the~~ U.S. News that devoted twenty-six magazine-size pages to it. Nor did ~~he~~ <sup>hurry</sup> I go to any bookstore to get a copy quickly. Gerald had promised to have his publisher send me one of the first copies and I ~~was~~ <sup>waited</sup> content to wait for that. It was <sup>wait</sup> my dear friend, the Wisconsin historian, Dr. David Wrone, who when he saw the book and what it is also bought one for me and gave it to me that I ~~first~~ <sup>first</sup> saw the book. If I had waited for Posner to keep his ~~word~~ word I would still be waiting as I write this.

<sup>Posner</sup> He also promised to have his publisher send me copies of the promotional material for the historical record of the thirtieth anniversary of the assassination. I have not received a single piece of ~~that kind of paper~~ <sup>from Random House.</sup>

And so it goes, in the old phrase Linda Ellerbee made so popular on TV.

Gerald told me he was writing a book on the many exponents of conspiracy theories they present as solutions to the crime. He said he regarded them as commercializers and exploiters of that tragedy. I have always believed that. Being in accord, I wanted to help him as much as I could, particularly when he told me he was just beginning his work.

The timing reflected in his book <sup>confirms that</sup> indicates he was then just beginning. <sup>he</sup> I explained <sup>how</sup> the files <sup>are arranged</sup> to him, those in particular, <sup>in which he expressed an interest</sup> indicated what those files hold about the people in whom he expressed most interest, and turned him and Trisha loose to work on their own, <sup>their</sup> unsupervised in <sup>their</sup> searching or in <sup>their</sup> copying.

<sup>Posner</sup> He comments (on Page 504) <sup>about</sup> how well and how ~~he~~ "graciously" he was received and on what he calls my "refreshing" attitude "toward sharing information with others." His reader has no way of knowing that "sharing" meant what copies he <sup>and got</sup> wanted/free. In effect his reader is told the opposite, that he got no copies here, because not once do his notes indicate that <sup>he did</sup> <sup>his book</sup> <sup>can</sup> <sup>even</sup> <sup>can</sup> Rather ~~they~~ reflect that he obtained the records he does <sup>even</sup> not know how to cite meaningfully by his ~~own~~ enterprise and effort.

As ~~Eller~~ Ellerbee like<sup>d</sup> to say, and so it goes.

<sup>(is part of Posner's)</sup>

In a sense, this ~~is his~~ portrayal of himself, personally and professionally, and the kind of person he is provides a means of ~~address~~ assessing the dependability of what he says.

Obvious as it is that contrary to his representation, he could not possibly have done all ~~that~~ he represents he did do personally, in almost all instances there is not even a hint of his sources for the work he claims as his *own*.

The work of Failure ~~Analysis Associates~~ <sup>id</sup> of great importance to him. It can fairly be said that without Failure Analysis's work he would not have had this book. But when he first<sup>ly</sup> mentions them in a lengthy note on pages 317-8 he avoids any mention of why or for whom they did the work he has as the basis for his book. ~~THE~~ His writing is calculated not to tell the reader and some<sup>y</sup> readers may <sup>u</sup> all believe they did their work for him. Why <sup>and for whom</sup> they undertook so large and costly an undertaking he does not ~~even~~ <sup>hint</sup> mention. One of the ways he suggests it was for him is his failure to say why<sup>y</sup> they did that work, <sup>is any</sup> ~~who their client was~~. Yet Posner has the use of what any client spent so much to get. No thanks to either here.

He is even careful to avoid letting readers know how they can communicate with Failure Analysis. Although it can be assumed, he does not even say that it is an American company.



When I was told some of the things Posner says about me in several notes I wrote and asked him about them. That he did not respond <sup>at first was</sup> attributable to ~~his~~ his need to engage in the extensive promotions arranged by Random House. After his New York TV appearances he was probably on the road with appearances around the country. <sup>but that did not last forever</sup>

That he did not write in response to my letter is not a fair basis for criticizing him. The conditions of his life may have made that impossible. He may also have believed that response by phone was not a good idea. However, the lack of any response leaves what he wrote <sup>d/</sup> published to speak for itself and for him, professionally and personally. *this is important in assessing him and his book.*

Some of what he says about me relates to what his publisher's vice president and executive editor, ~~Rosner's editor~~, Bob Loomis, told Publishers Weekly about it. Loomis shares Posner's dedication of the book with Trisha. Of Loomis Posner said, he is "my <sup>d</sup> editor who nurtured this project from its inception." Loomis, then is an authority on the book, its content and purposes.

In addition to <sup>my</sup> boast that Posner had "closed the case" and about those <sup>rare</sup> computer enhancements and Posner's use of them, Loomis said of that book that, "At heart, it is a biography of Lee Harvey Oswald.... Posner <sup>separate</sup> takes up episodes as it goes along.... separate episodes as they occur in history - episodes in Oswald's life."

My work in New Orleans, extensive for me in those years when I was without income and in debt, was on Oswald, trying to pick leads up and trace them. I did no work <sup>the man distrustful about my Jim Malone had visited,</sup> on Clay Shaw there, despite what we'll come to that Posner just made up, having no reason to believe it, in which he suggests the opposite. I was there when the Shaw <sup>trial</sup> case opened and for its first four days. I did not enter the courtroom and never laid eyes on Shaw. My interest in New Orleans was <sup>once</sup> Oswald, <sup>learning</sup> more about him and any associates.

<sup>Posner, the</sup> As ~~the~~ supposed biographer of Oswald does not say, Oswald did have associates in New Orleans. In fact <sup>Posner</sup> as refers to FBI records which indicate <sup>this yet he</sup> it and makes no mention of <sup>that</sup> that while using those <sup>very</sup> records for his own preconceived purpose. He did not use them in any investigation.



(As a Soviet citizen ~~go~~g for her it would have been re-entry.)



Posner is writing a biography of Oswald and does not include in his bibliography the only book on his career <sup>in New Orleans?</sup> there?



51 ~~31~~

At the same time I express my appreciate for the helpfulness of his petty mendacities. They establish beyond question, as he also does elsewhere, that Posner has and is familiar with my book <sup>Oswald in New Orleans</sup> (that is not in his <sup>biography</sup> ~~biography~~ (Page 585), <sup>Oswald in New Orleans</sup>).

When I noted that omission, we checked out records. And, sure enough, that is the one book Posner did not get when he was here. His book makes clear that he has my book and because he got all but that one when he was here, it seems reasonable that he had it before he came here. What he ~~twists~~ <sup>here</sup> ~~and lies about~~ appears, of all my work, only on pages 79 and 80 of the one book he did not get where he was here.

51A 7 Here is his note that pinpoints the source he was careful not to give:

**\*\*In his address book, Oswald had three addresses listed on the same page with Carlos Bringuier's name: 117 Camp, 107 Decatur, and 1032 Canal. Harold Weisberg claimed the first address was a formal-dress shop and the second did not exist. He then juggled the numbers and determined that if Oswald had meant 107 Camp and 117 Decatur, that would lead to two anti-Castro militants. It shows the extent to which some will speculate. In fact, Weisberg searched the addresses when he helped Jim Garrison in his 1967 investigation. Instead, a review of 1963 records reveals there is no mystery or mixup. 117 Camp was the Hispanic-American Discount House, owned by two prominent Cubans (it was only a dress shop when Weisberg saw it years later). 107 Decatur was Bringuier's Casa Roca. 1032 Canal was at the corner of Canal and Ramparts, the New Orleans Discount Center, owned by a Jewish Cuban. The addresses were part of Oswald's efforts to discover the headquarters of the Cuban exiles.** *It note that Posner into me*

*Source in 26th line*

This is what I actually wrote:

A number of other provocative items scattered throughout the evidence raise questions for which there is no satisfactory answer. For example, in Oswald's pocket address book there are these notations on a page (16H67) that faces a blank page:

Cuban Student  
Derectorate (sic)  
107 Decatur St  
New Orleans, La  
Carlos Bringuier

N.O. City Editor "Cowan"  
David Crawford  
reporter

117 Camp  
107 Decatur  
1032 Canal

After the middle of these three addresses but extending upward from it is "cuban exile store." This is the

address of Bringuier's store. Why is it listed twice? What do the other two addresses represent? The Camp street address is across from the International Trade Mart, which since then has moved. It is the address of a clothing store where formal attire is rented. Oswald had no such interests. Why should he have noted it in association with Bringuier?

Or did he make a mistake, or have his own special code? In the building at 107 Camp Street, the Cigali Building, advertising man Ronnie Caire, who was connected with the anti-Castro Cuban groups, then had an office. It was on the Canal Street side, opposite the

Camp Street entrance. Caire says Oswald applied for a job with him, claiming public relations experience. It should by now not surprise the reader to learn that Caire is one of the multitude who were not called as witnesses by the Commission and should have been. His New Orleans reputation is excellent. He is considered a generous man, easily touched. He says he lost about \$10,000 on his effort to help the "Crusade," that about \$4,000 was raised, and that some of it was "pocketed" by another.

That he was not called as a witness is not because the FBI was unaware of these things. Caire complains that their questionings "cost me about 100 hours" of time.

The Canal Street address is not where Oswald was arrested, which was in the 700 block, and it is not a "good" address but was then and is now a blank one. The numbers go from 1030 to 1034. In the covered-over passageway on that side of 1030 is a small fruitstand. Its number is 1030½.

If Oswald made a mistake and meant 117 Decatur, that is the address of Orest Pena's Habana Bar and Lounge, where there were other interesting developments in the story of Oswald in New Orleans, and at about this time, notably the spectacular and conspicuous drunk staged there by Oswald or his counterfeiter. And why should Oswald have noted the names of the city editor and reporter in the middle of these entries.

We do not know whether he made these notes before or after he got himself arrested in this handbill operation, which makes sense only as part of a scheme to establish a "cover." But there is reason to believe it was not after the arrest, because there is what seems to be such an item in his notebook (16H62), also facing a blank page. It is the listing of WDSU-TV, over which he broadcast after his arrest. This listing has the names of several of its staff and their phone numbers

but no address. It logically would have been entered after his arrest.

When this manner of establishing a "cover" is considered in conjunction with the strange business of his notebook copyings and his possession at the time of his arrest of a list of entries that could serve only to show he had been a defector to the Soviet Union, along with the equally perplexing plea of guilty he entered when he was not guilty, it is apparent the whole affair requires explanation the government has not made.

The least likely preparation of a sincere Castro sympathizer sallying forth on a propaganda venture that could lead to his arrest is evidence of Communist or Russian connections. This handbill operation seems to have been designed for an arrest and a police record. As soon as Oswald harvested the "pro-Castro" press he thus made, he took it to Mexico with him and used it in an unsuccessful effort to get a Cuban visa. After this failed, he still kept reminders of the affair. One was found when the Dallas police searched his property in the garage of the Paine residence, in Irving, Texas, after his arrest on November 22, 1963. In the inventory of what was seized there is Item #231 (24H335), a "slip of paper containing names Carlos J. Bringuier, Miguel M. Cruz and Lt. William Gaillot." Cruz was with Bringuier when he broke up Oswald's handbill operation; Gaillot, the police officer in charge.

Such items and entries in the notebook would be less troubling if there were any serious official explanation of their purpose and if so many questions did not remain, so many indications of Oswald's intelligence involvement.







54

Posner brackets this with "in fact, Weisberg searched the addresses when ~~xxxx~~ <sup>he</sup> ~~is manufacturing~~ helped Jim Garrison in his 1967 investigation." Again Posner has no source. The reason is that there cannot be one. Unless, of course, he was again fed bad information from the spookeries. *it is another lie.*

Is it not obvious that ~~it~~ there is no way in which Posner can know that I ~~searched,~~ <sup>an appropriate</sup> ~~hardly~~ the word, "for Garrison?" *could not* *what he here writes?*

How where <sup>in asking</sup> I do "speculate," there being none in what Posner refers to, <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ *I write that Posner was careful not to quote in his book, is* what drives a man like him to go out of his <sup>way</sup> ~~and~~ become a blatant liar just to make something up he can <sup>mis</sup> use to belittle another?

I do not know what sources, if any, Posner had for his baseless disputing of what I said about that ~~the~~ Canal Street address. I was there. I noted the addresses. I took pictures because I was mystified <sup>by Oswald's</sup> ~~about~~ entering a nonexisting address in ~~his~~ <sup>book</sup> ~~address~~ <sup>book</sup>. Not only was it exactly as I wrote, I took pictures and I remember even which camera I used. Need <sup>ing</sup> ~~nothing~~ but a snapshot I used our Yashica reflect.

The irrationality of <sup>Posner's</sup> ~~his~~ fabrication is obvious: with a staff of professional police investigators working for him did <sup>G</sup>arrison need anyone else to make a property check for him?

Posner again made up out of nothing save his own bile, unless more stupidity was fed him by his spooks, that "The addresses were part of Oswald's efforts to discover the headquarters of the Cuban exiles."

There was no such thing in New Orleans to be "discovered" then!

The CIA's Cuban Revolutionary Council had folded when <sup>to CIA</sup> ~~it~~ withdrew financial support. *in April, 1962.* *its*

Why else would Oswald have been reduced to provoking The Stupidity? If he had any other choice he would have exercised it!

Posner <sup>made</sup> ~~pretend~~ an interest in Oswald's use of that 544 Camp Street address. If he had not been ignorant, <sup>not</sup> ~~not~~ having done his own work and depending on others, <sup>would</sup> ~~he~~ have been interested in what I at the very place <sup>write that</sup> ~~he~~ distorts, misrepresents and just plain lies about, that Oswald applied to a <sup>3</sup> Ronnie Caire for a job. Ronnie Caire and Sergio ~~Serba~~ Arcacha Smith has <sup>a</sup> "Crusade to Free Cuba" scam going and they solicited contributions to

58  
5-5

official "symbol"

~~be~~ sent to that address. Ronnie Caire was also an FBI informer. If Posner had had any interest at all he'd have found duplicate copies of those FBI records filed under Ronnie Caire's name in a file <sup>Cabinet</sup> I know he <sup>Searched</sup> worked it.

~~Withal~~ Withal, Posner addresses all he misrepresents out of context, the reason I include the last paragraph from the part of Oswald in New Orleans he misused <sup>in</sup> with such pettiness, the context of the whole thing; "Such items and entries in the notebook would be less troubling if there were any serious official explanation of their purpose and if so many questions did not remain, so many indications of ~~ed~~ Oswald's intelligence involvement."

Aside from all that is factually ~~wrong~~ about Posner's ~~note~~ note, all that is just made up out of nothing, like that "investigating" for Garrison who had a professional staff of police investigators <sup>office</sup> on his staff, <sup>Posner indicates</sup> all that has no source indicated because there is no source for what he makes up out of nothing. <sup>the</sup> why does a man of serious purpose to which Posner pretends, with so much work to do and so little time for it, go off into such ~~sewers~~ sewers of indecency, immorality and irresponsibility?

Can it be other than ~~on~~ on the one hand he serves another interest or on the other that he is <sup>so</sup> small a person he needs <sup>to</sup> run others down to build himself up in his own mind?

There are very few people <sup>Posner</sup> he has not abused the same way and with the same lack of integrity.

What does or can drive the man to this bad behavior, this demeaning of himself?

Other than his futile attempt to portray my work as inaccurate. Of all my writing <sup>six</sup> in ~~six~~ books on the subject <sup>and</sup> this is all he can <sup>v</sup> connive out of nothing?

In this pettiness and in his error in his book Posner ~~does~~, however, give us a ~~✓~~ means of assessing those ~~th~~ regard as dependable sources, for example Carlos Bringuier. Of all the hundreds of people Posner claims to have interviewed, he singles Bringuier out

for special praise and thanks. But when he was here and had unsupervised access to all I have and when he was working in the very file <sup>subject</sup> in which I have duplicates of some of the FBI's records on Bringuier, whose name is on that file folder, Posner had no interest in what the FBI reported about Bringuier or in ~~xxxx~~ any other information about him that I had. A peek at some of those FBI records serves to describe the confidence that can be placed in Posner's writing and to describe those he ~~x~~ regards as good sources worthy of being singled out <sup>and praised</sup> (as such in his book.

At "approximately 10:25 PM" the night of the day of the assassination, Bringuier phoned the New Orleans FBI office. His call was taken by Special Agent Warren C. DeBrueys, an agent fluent in Spanish and one of the "Oswald experts" in that office. In DeBrueys' words in his memo to the special agent in charge, Bringuier asked "the FBI for protection."

Q (This was only the fifteenth record placed in the New Orleans FBI office's file on that assassination, <sup>89-69, That is a file the purpose of which</sup> ~~one that~~ Posner did not understand is that file in using what he got from me as his own work and giving the ~~unexplained~~ file number only ~~aaahiaaaaaaa~~ only ~~if~~ when he was not able to give its meaning or even its title, "Assassination of ~~John F. Kennedy~~." DeBrueys wrote, "BRINGUIER was advised that the FBI does not afford police protection." This reflects Bringuier's irrational concept of his own importance and his paranoia. It also reflects the maturity of Bringuier's judgement, that <sup>too,</sup> he would be a target of ~~an~~ assassination, ~~also!~~

Once I read Bringuier's Warren Commission testimony I had no reason to be interested ~~him~~ in him when I was in New Orleans for the first time, to testify before the ~~the~~ grand jury in the Clay Shaw case. ~~But~~ I was interested in Orest Pena's bar because Oswald supposedly stated a spectacular <sup>attention-getting</sup> drunk there. So before one of the detectives whose name I have forgotten <sup>drove me</sup> to the airport he did drive me to several places I want to look at, including Pena's bar. ~~and~~ He parked the car illegally ~~across~~ the street from that bar, on the sidewalk of the U.S. Customs House, <sup>He wasn't</sup> ~~there,~~ and I was taking pictures of the front <sup>of</sup> Pena's bar when Bringuier came rushing out of his place of business, which was not even next to Pena's. Bringuier was in a running crouch, literally, and he had a camera to his eye, snapping pictures while he ran in that ~~odd-looking~~ crouch. When he got near



me, <sup>giving</sup> with every indication that he was about to jump on me, the detective<sup>d</sup> intervened. He turned Bringuier away and <sup>in</sup> mutters in Spanish, Bringuier retreated to his store, with malevolent glances over a shoulder <sup>or</sup> as he returned to his store.

If ~~this~~ this is no crazy enough, what Bringuier next did is ample illustration of why he was so absolutely dependable as a source <sup>in</sup> ~~for~~ Posner.

In his <sup>memo</sup> report to ~~his~~ the special agent in charge ~~of~~ FBI Special Agent ~~of~~ Robert J. Heibel reported that on May 9, 1967 Bringuier "insisted that" the FBI "accept a photograph he (BRINGUIER) had taken of author JACK WEISBERG <sup>(sic)</sup> and an investigator <sup>of</sup> of JAMES GARRISON who were photographing BRINGUIER's store." Which we were not at all, but if we had been, that is so criminal an act that the FBI absolutely must have a picture of me?

Heibel <sup>el/</sup> noted <sup>the picture</sup> as "is contained in NO 89-69-1A104." That is a subfile of that office's main assassination file. The subfile was used for hold evidence!

And sure enough, in an "evidence envelope," FBI Form No. 340, Heibel <sup>el</sup> placed two of Bringuier's pictures. His note <sup>on</sup> that "evidence" envelope reflects how confused Bringuier got him. It reads, "2 PHOTOGRAPHS OF JACK WEISBURG AND INVESTIGATOR OF DA GARRISON TAKEN BY BRINGUIER AS THEY PHOTOGRAPHED HIS STORE, <sup>(sic)</sup> LA HABANA <sup>LA</sup> ON DECATUR STREET, NOLA." (NOLA means New Orleans, Louisiana.)

The name of Bringuier's store was Casa Roca. Habana was the name of Pens's bar.

One picture shows me protecting my eyes from the sun when Bringuier started to charge while photographing, the other shows the detective and me just standing there talking.

That Bringuier was exploited by the extreme of the religious radical right in his fanciful explanations of the assassination is reflected in several FBI reports of his appearances under the sponsorship of ~~DR~~ "Dr. BILLY JAMES (sic) HARGIS <sup>u</sup> and his "Christians Ant-Communist Crusade." This the New Orleans FBI filed, or all placed, in its main Oswald file, 100-10461. The two serials of which I made duplicate copies are numbered 6723 and 6724.

Skipping ahead to <sup>October</sup> November 11, 1968, that FBI office filed what is <sup>c</sup> called an

58A

So there can be no question about this, Bruinguier is the first of only five people Posner singled out for special thanks and praise' (~~page 502~~):

"Almost ~~of~~ two hundred people were interviewed for this book. While I am grateful to all of them for the time they took to speak to me with me, a few made an extra effort. Carlos Bruinguier clarified the anti-Castro issues as well as the problems in New Orleans in ~~1964~~ 1963; ..." (page 502)

"airtel," fancy <sup>FBI</sup> name for normal airmailing of a memorandum, <sup>to</sup> ~~with~~ headquarters <sup>to</sup> and two other field offices. What was so important that nine copies of it <sup>u</sup> were made is that Bringuier told <sup>it</sup> that I had been in touch with a young man named Phillip Geraci, III, who was in Viet Nam, <sup>u</sup> ~~which~~ Bringuier's source <sup>u</sup> ~~is~~ that was not true. She also is quoted by Bringuier as <sup>u</sup> ~~having~~ <sup>Saying that I</sup> told Geraci that on his ~~ret~~ return to the United States Geraci would be subpoenaed to testify before the grand jury.

Geraci was one of ~~2~~ two youngsters who were in Bringuier's store when Oswald was there in 1963. I had not been in touch with him. Bringuier's source was a young woman who was also <sup>a</sup> ~~my~~ source. <sup>for me</sup> ~~and in fact arranged for her~~ She was also a police narcotics informant and in her undependability she rivalled Bringuier.

While I had not been <sup>u</sup> in touch with Geraci, as that young woman knew, she also knew that I had interviewed his parents and she in fact told me that Geraci had been ~~u~~ returned to the United States by the army not for the reason in this FBI report, because "one of the members of his family is very ill," but because his father, an electrician, had killed himself in an accident.

This matter will interest us later <sup>u</sup> but here I cite it as a reflection of Bringuier's <sup>u</sup> ~~dependability~~ as a source, when he got virtually all of that mixed up and inaccurate, and of what the FBI regards as important enough <sup>u</sup> ~~to~~ to be stored in so many copies in so many places.

In the forgoing we have, among other things, illustrated that there <sup>u</sup> ~~is~~ nothing too irrational, obviously ~~u~~ <sup>u</sup> ~~natty~~, like Bringuier, for Posner not to use as a dependable source <sup>u</sup> if he says what Posner wants to hear and say, and that when Posner had and knew he had free <sup>u</sup> ~~access~~ to FBI records relating to the character of <sup>u</sup> ~~this~~ source in whom <sup>u</sup> ~~he~~ placed such confidence, Posner did not ~~u~~ <sup>u</sup> ~~have~~ <sup>u</sup> ~~any~~ interest in learning <sup>u</sup> ~~what~~ after any contact with Bringuier he ~~u~~ <sup>u</sup> ~~knows~~ had to know, that Bringuier is not dependable. 58A here

This <sup>u</sup> ~~is~~ also a reflection of how little Posner knew or wanted to know about what transpired in New Orleans and of his dependence upon the most undependable <sup>u</sup> ~~of~~ of sources for what <sup>u</sup> ~~he~~ wrote about it. It is more than obvious that Posner did not do his own work there. Could not have, in fact, and <sup>u</sup> ~~managed~~ to be largely incorrect in what he wrote about it.